

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

MICHAEL EDWARD WATSON,

Defendant.

Case No. 3:18-cr-00025-MMD-CLB-1

ORDER

**I. SUMMARY**

Defendant Michael Edward Watson is serving a 48-month sentence at the Federal Correctional Complex at Terminal Island for possession of child pornography. (ECF No. 48 at 2-3.) Before the Court is Defendant's motion for compassionate release under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A)(i) based on the "extraordinary and compelling reasons" presented by the COVID-19 pandemic<sup>1</sup> as applied to his health condition.<sup>2</sup> (ECF No. 46 (the "Motion").) For the reasons explained below, the Court will grant the Motion.

**II. BACKGROUND**

On November 2, 2018, Defendant pled guilty to possession of child pornography in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 2252A(a)(5)(B). (ECF No. 23 at 3-6; ECF No. 26.) He admitted that he had downloaded images and videos depicting children engaging in sexually explicit conduct. (ECF No. 48 at 3.) On February 8, 2019, the Court sentenced him to 48

---

<sup>1</sup>The Court issues this order during the COVID-19 ("COVID") pandemic, as a novel coronavirus is killing many people around the world, and many governments, including the governments of the United States and Nevada, have at least partially shut down their societies and economies in response.

<sup>2</sup>The government opposes his release. (ECF No. 48.) Defendant filed a reply. (ECF No. 49.) In its response, the government asked the Court to permit victims to be heard (ECF No. 48 at 14), and subsequently indicated it has not received any response to its notice to victims (ECF No. 50).

1 months in prison and ordered Defendant to surrender for service of sentence on May 13,  
2 2019. (ECF No. 48 at 3; *see also* ECF No. 34.)

3 Defendant has served 14 months out of his 48-month sentence. (ECF No. 46 at 2;  
4 ECF No. 48 at 2.) During his incarceration, he tested positive for COVID but was  
5 asymptomatic, and his diagnosis has been resolved. (ECF No. 46 at 7; ECF No. 48 at 13;  
6 ECF No. 47 at 86, 93.) Defendant is now in lockdown in a one-room dorm with other  
7 inmates who tested positive for COVID. (ECF No. 46 at 9, 11, 13.) Defendant suffers from  
8 asthma, obesity, hyperlipidemia, gout, testicular dysfunction, autism, unspecified  
9 genitourinary symptoms, and mild osteo-arthritis. (ECF No. 46 at 4, 14-20.)

### 10 **III. LEGAL STANDARD**

11 Defendant specifically seeks release under the compassionate release provision  
12 of 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A)(i), as amended by the First Step Act (“FSA”) of 2018. (ECF  
13 No. 46 at 1.) This provision offers Defendant a limited exception to the general rule that  
14 the Court may not modify or reduce the length of a sentence after the Court has imposed  
15 it. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c); *see also U.S. v. Penna*, 319 F.3d 509, 511 (9th Cir. 2003)  
16 (explaining that generally a court cannot modify a sentence after it has imposed it). “It  
17 allows the sentencing judge to reduce a sentence based on ‘extraordinary and compelling  
18 reasons’ after the defendant has asked the [Bureau of Prison (“BOP”)] to bring such a  
19 motion on her behalf and exhausted all administrative rights to appeal the BOP’s denial  
20 of that request.” *United States v. Mogavero*, Case No. 2:15-cr-74-JAD-NJK, 2020 WL  
21 1853754, at \*2 (D. Nev. Apr. 13, 2020) (citing 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A)(i)). Moreover,  
22 before granting such a request, the Court “must consider the factors in 18 U.S.C. §  
23 3553(a) ‘to the extent that they are applicable,’ and any sentence reduction must be  
24 ‘consistent with applicable policy statements issued by the Sentencing Commission.’” *Id.*  
25 (citations omitted).

### 26 **IV. DISCUSSION**

27 The Court follows a three-step process to evaluate the Motion. The Court first  
28 addresses whether Defendant has satisfied the statutory prerequisites under Section

1 3582(c)(1)(A), then whether Defendant has shown “extraordinary and compelling  
2 reasons” for the Court to release him under Section 3582(c)(1)(A)(i), and then addresses  
3 the applicable policy statements and sentencing factors, as it must under Section  
4 3582(c)(1)(A). To reiterate, the Court will grant Defendant’s Motion.

5 **A. Statutory Prerequisites**

6 Section 3582(c)(1)(A) requires that a defendant ask the BOP to bring a motion for  
7 compassionate release on the defendant’s behalf before filing such a motion with the  
8 court, normally done by submitting a request to the warden. See *also* 18 U.S.C. §  
9 3582(c)(1)(A). In addition, a defendant may only bring a motion under Section  
10 3582(c)(1)(A) “after the defendant has fully exhausted all administrative rights to appeal  
11 a failure of the Bureau of Prisons to bring a motion on the defendant’s behalf or the lapse  
12 of 30 days from the receipt of such a request by the warden of the defendant’s facility,  
13 whichever is earlier[.]” *Id.*

14 On May 20, 2020, Defendant submitted a request for compassionate release to  
15 the Warden (ECF No. 46-2 at 2) but has not received a response as of the date of the  
16 Motion (filed June 19, 2020). “The government concedes that [Defendant] has satisfied  
17 the statutory, jurisdictional requirements under [S]ection 3582(c).” (ECF No. 48 at 6.) The  
18 Court agrees.

19 **B. Extraordinary and Compelling Reasons**

20 Having found Defendant satisfied the statutory prerequisites, the Court moves on  
21 to the merits of the Motion.

22 The parties agree that Defendant’s medical conditions puts him at a high risk of  
23 COVID complications, but they disagree on whether he is at a high risk of contracting the  
24 disease. (ECF No. 46 at 7-14, 20; ECF No. 48 at 12-13.) Defendant argues that he can  
25 and will likely be reinfected by his dormmates, who tested positive for COVID. (ECF No.  
26 46 at 12-13.) The government counters that Defendant already contracted COVID and  
27 was asymptomatic, implying that he cannot be reinfected. (ECF No. 48 at 13.)  
28

1           The Court finds that there exist extraordinary and compelling reasons for granting  
 2 the Motion. While the science is unclear on whether reinfection is possible, “the Court  
 3 must err on the side of caution to avoid potentially lethal consequences for [Defendant].”  
 4 *United States v. Yellin*, Case No. 3:15-CR-3181-BTM-1, 2020 WL 3488738, at \*1-2 (S.D.  
 5 Cal. June 26, 2020) (finding extraordinary and compelling reasons exist where COVID-  
 6 positive inmate at Terminal Island, who did not develop severe symptoms, had a  
 7 combination of medical conditions that made him at risk of COVID complications).  
 8 Defendant’s undisputed medical conditions, which put him at higher risks should he  
 9 become reinfected, further supports the Court’s finding of compelling reasons. Moreover,  
 10 as Defendant pointed out, Terminal Island previously maintained a certain ratio of sex  
 11 offenders to non-sex offenders to ensure the safety of all inmates, but the prison has  
 12 abandoned that policy in responding to the pandemic. (ECF No. 46 at 13.) Defendant is  
 13 fearful of the non-sex offenders in his dormitory who harass and intimidate him. (ECF No.  
 14 46-1 at 2-3.) The government has not addressed this issue. For the foregoing reasons,  
 15 the Court finds that there exist extraordinary and compelling reasons for granting the  
 16 Motion.

### 17           **C.     Applicable Policy Statements**

18           Under the FSA, any sentence reduction for “extraordinary and compelling  
 19 circumstances” must be “consistent with applicable policy statements issued by the  
 20 Sentencing Commission.” 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A)(i). Before the FSA’s passage, the  
 21 Sentencing Commission issued a policy statement (U.S.S.G. § 1B1.13 at cmt. 1 (the  
 22 “Policy Statement”)) that limited “extraordinary and compelling reasons” to four  
 23 scenarios.<sup>3</sup> *U.S.A. v. Defendant(s)*, Case No. 2:99-cr-00257-CAS-3, 2020 WL 1864906,  
 24 at \*5 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 13, 2020).

---

25  
 26           <sup>3</sup>The Policy Statement identifies only four qualifying conditions: (1) a serious  
 27 medical condition (i.e., that the defendant is either “suffering from a terminal illness” or  
 28 some other serious condition “that substantially diminishes the ability of the defendant to  
 provide self-care” in prison); (2) the defendant’s age in combination with a medical  
 condition (i.e., that the defendant is at least 65 years old, is experiencing deteriorating

1           The government argues that the Court is limited to considering conditions outlined  
 2 in the Policy Statement, none of which Defendant qualifies for because he has already  
 3 recovered from COVID and is being well cared for by BOP medical staff. (ECF No. 48 at  
 4 6, 12-13.) But the Court's discretion is not limited to the conditions set forth in the Policy  
 5 Statement. See *United States v. Regas*, Case No. 3:91-cr-57-MMD-NA-1, 2020 WL  
 6 2926457, at \*3-4 (D. Nev. June 3, 2020). The Court therefore finds that the government's  
 7 argument is without merit.

#### 8           **D. Section 3553(a) Factors**

9           The Court must next consider the factors set forth in Section 3553(a) to the extent  
 10 they are applicable. These factors include: (1) the nature and circumstances of the  
 11 offense and the history and characteristics of the defendant; (2) the need for the sentence  
 12 imposed; (3) the kinds of sentences available; (4) the kinds of sentence and the  
 13 sentencing range established in the Sentencing Guidelines; (5) any pertinent policy  
 14 statement issued by the Sentencing Commission<sup>4</sup>; (6) the need to avoid unwarranted  
 15 sentence disparities among defendants with similar records who have been found guilty  
 16 of similar conduct; and (7) the need to provide restitution to any victims. 18 U.S.C. §  
 17 3553(a)(1)-(7). As to the Section 3553(a)(2) factor, the need for a sentence must be  
 18 sufficient, but not greater than necessary, to serve the purpose of "just punishment,  
 19 deterrence, protection of the public, and rehabilitation." *Dean v. United States*, 137 S. Ct.  
 20 1170, 1175 (2017) (citation and internal quotes omitted).

21           The government argues that the Section 3553(a) factors weigh against granting  
 22 the Motion, given the gravity of Defendant's offense and because his COVID symptoms

23  
 24  
 25 health, and has served a substantial portion of her sentence); (3) certain family  
 26 circumstances (e.g., the incapacitation of a spouse); or (4) some other reason  
 "determined by the Director of the [BOP]." See U.S.S.G. § 1B1.13 at cmt. 1.

27           <sup>4</sup>Because the Sentencing Commission never released guidelines with respect to  
 28 compassionate release under the FSA, Section 3553(a)(5)'s pertinent policy statement  
 factor is neutral. *United States v. Regas*, Case No. 3:91-cr-57-MMD-NA-1, 2020 WL  
 2926457, at \*4 n.7 (D. Nev. June 3, 2020) (citation omitted).

1 have resolved. (ECF No. 48 at 14.) Defendant asserts that he is at a low risk of recidivism  
2 because he has no criminal history, does not abuse substances, has taken an array of  
3 classes in prison, and has been a model prisoner. (ECF No. 46 at 20-21.) Defendant also  
4 points out that the government has failed to address the possibility of Defendant's  
5 reinfection and his vulnerability to COVID complications. (ECF No. 49 at 2-3.)

6 While the nature and circumstances of Defendant's offense are indeed serious,  
7 the Court agrees with Defendant's arguments. In particular, Defendant has demonstrated  
8 that he is at low risk of recidivism because the offense of conviction was his first, he was  
9 in compliance while on pretrial release and has demonstrated an effort to work towards  
10 rehabilitation and self-improvement during his time in custody. In addition to the  
11 conditions imposed at the time of sentencing, requiring home confinement for a period of  
12 24 months as an additional special condition sufficiently addresses the need to protect  
13 the public. On balance, the Court finds that the Section 3553(a) factors weigh in favor of  
14 releasing Defendant.

## 15 **V. CONCLUSION**

16 The Court notes that the parties made several arguments and cited to several  
17 cases not discussed above. The Court has reviewed these arguments and cases and  
18 determines that they do not warrant discussion as they do not affect the outcome of the  
19 Motion before the Court.

20 It is therefore ordered that Defendant's motion for compassionate release (ECF  
21 No. 46) is granted.

22 It is further ordered that Defendant is subject to lifetime supervised release as  
23 imposed in the Judgment (ECF No. 34).

24 It is further ordered that in addition to the mandatory, standard and special  
25 conditions of release imposed in the Judgment, the Court imposes an added special  
26 condition of home confinement with location monitoring for a period of 24 months.

1 It is further ordered that Defendant be placed in self-quarantine for a 14-day period  
2 consistent with BOP policy before he is released.

3 DATED THIS 22<sup>nd</sup> day of July 2020.

4  
5 

6 MIRANDA M. DU  
7 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28